

# AMERICAN MUSEUM *Novitates*

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY  
CENTRAL PARK WEST AT 79TH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10024  
Number 3025, 23 pp., 8 figures, 5 tables November 26, 1991

## Call Production by Myrmecophilous Riodinid and Lycaenid Butterfly Caterpillars (Lepidoptera): Morphological, Acoustical, Functional, and Evolutionary Patterns

P. J. DEVRIES<sup>1</sup>

### ABSTRACT

One hundred thirty species of butterfly caterpillars in five families were surveyed for their ability to produce low-amplitude, substrate-borne calls. Among these, calling was found in 19 species of riodinids and 30 species of lycaenids. The trait occurs in taxa originating from South America, North America, Europe, Southeast Asia, and Australia, but is known only from species that form symbioses with ants. Descriptions and acoustic analyses of calls are provided for most of the taxa surveyed. New evidence indicates that vibratory papillae and epicranial granulations are components of riodinid stridulatory organs. Variation in

the morphology of vibratory papillae and specialized epicranial granulations is described in the riodinid tribes Lemoniini and Nymphidiini, and is compared to that in members of the tribe Eurybiini. Morphological evidence indicates that the ability to call has evolved three times—twice in the riodinids, and at least once in the lycaenids. The calls of riodinid and lycaenid caterpillars and pupae are compared, and their function is discussed in the context of previous work. Evidence suggests that the ability to call may be important in other insect groups that form symbioses with ants.

### INTRODUCTION

Among butterflies, only caterpillars in the families Riodinidae and Lycaenidae form symbiotic associations with ants. Myrmecophilous caterpillars in both groups may

possess adaptations for forming such symbioses. These typically include organs that produce food secretions for ants, organs that produce semiochemicals that modify ant be-

<sup>1</sup> Visiting Research Scholar, Department of Zoology, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712; Scientific Associate, Center for Conservation Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305.

havior (Cottrell, 1984; DeVries, 1988; DeVries and Baker, 1989), and a thickened body cuticle (Malicky, 1970). The riodinids and lycaenids are separate monophyletic groups (Ehrlich 1958; Eliot, 1973; Kristensen, 1976; Harvey, 1987; Robbins, 1988) together forming what is often referred to as the lycaenoid butterflies. Differences of opinion exist as to whether riodinids and lycaenids should be considered separate families (sensu Eliot, 1973) or subfamilies within a single family (sensu Ehrlich 1958)—the phylogenetic relationships within and among these groups are unresolved. While the evolution of butterfly myrmecophily is most often treated as a single event (e.g., Hinton, 1951; Pierce, 1987), the nonhomologous nature of riodinid and lycaenid caterpillar organs indicates that myrmecophily has arisen at least twice (DeVries, 1991a). Tracing the phylogenetic relationships of the riodinids and lycaenids will necessitate a thorough cladistic analysis, a task well beyond the scope of this paper. However, because larval morphology indicates that myrmecophily evolved independently in the Riodinidae and Lycaenidae, I have considered them to be separate families.

During a study of symbioses between riodinid butterfly caterpillars and ants, I became interested in how three sets of myrmecophilous organs on *Thisbe irenea* (Stoll) caterpillars function to maintain the attention of ants (fig. 1). One set of myrmecophilous organs, termed vibratory papillae, were suggested to function as stridulatory organs (DeVries, 1988). That work led to the documentation of acoustical signals produced by both riodinid and lycaenid butterfly caterpillars that form symbioses with ants, and to the suggestion that caterpillar acoustical signals were an important part of the evolution of butterfly myrmecophily (DeVries, 1990).

This paper seeks to enhance our understanding of caterpillar signals in five ways: (1) furnishing basic caterpillar call descriptions and acoustic analyses for various riodinid and lycaenid species; (2) presenting and discussing new morphological and experimental evidence regarding how riodinid stridulatory mechanisms function; (3) providing a comparison of acoustic signals between riodinid and lycaenid caterpillars; (4) discussing the

function and evolution of caterpillar and pupal signals in the context of forming symbioses with ants; and (5) presenting the caterpillar-ant system as a potential model that could be extended to other insect groups.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Insect acoustical signals are often divided into two categories based on how their energy is transmitted. Although it is not always easy to separate the two types of signals (Gogala, 1985), those that are transmitted through air are called sound, and those that are substrate-borne are called vibrational signals. This paper is concerned with signals produced by riodinid and lycaenid butterfly caterpillars that are substrate-borne and are detectable only with sensitive instruments. These are technically considered vibrational signals. However, in choosing a term for such signals, I have considered two things: (1) unlike those found in lycaenid pupae (e.g., Downey and Allyn, 1978), the amplitude of caterpillar signals makes it unlikely that they function as defenses, and they are clearly not sexual in nature (DeVries, 1990, personal obs.), and (2) the experimental evidence suggests that ants detect and respond positively to caterpillars' signals (DeVries, 1990). Thus, the term "call" seems both appropriate and unambiguous for the signals produced by these caterpillars.

One hundred thirty species of live butterfly caterpillars in five families were surveyed for their ability to produce calls (tables 1–5). My caterpillar survey represents material from six biogeographic regions: South America, Central America, North America, Europe, Southeast Asia, and Australia. The material was either found during the course of my fieldwork or was provided by colleagues. Generally, late-instar caterpillars were examined, but whenever possible all instars of a taxon were surveyed. Calls were detected by a Bennett-Clark (1984) particle velocity microphone using the methods described in DeVries (1991b), and then recorded on a Marantz PMD 420 cassette tape recorder. Many of the calls were subsequently analyzed with a Kay DSP Model 5500 Sonagraph and a Data 6000 wave-form analyzer. The sonagrams and waveforms were made on a Kay




Fig. 1. Final instar of *Thisbe irenea* (Riodinidae: Lemoniini) from Panama producing a call while walking to a feeding area. An escort of *Ectatomma ruidum* (Ponerinae) ants, such as those illustrated, have been demonstrated to vigorously defend a caterpillar from predators.

Fig. 2. Mature instar of *Nymphidium* sp. (Riodinidae: Nymphidiini) from Ecuador being tended by a group of myrmecine ants. Unlike other congeners, this *Nymphidium* species produces a call.

TABLE 1

**Caterpillar Species Tested that Did Not Produce Calls**

(The groups represented are: Papilionidae-Papilioninae; Pieridae-Coliadinae, Pierinae; Nymphalidae-Charaxinae, Apaturinae, Nymphalinae, Heliconiinae, Melitaeinae, Ithomiinae, Danainae, Morphinae, Brassoliniinae, and Satyrinae.)

Taxon (number)	Origin
<b>Papilionidae</b>	
<i>Papilio thoas nealces</i> Rothschild & Jordan (3)	Panama
<i>Papilio birchalli godmanii</i> Rothschild & Jordan (2)	Costa Rica
<i>Eurytides ilus</i> (Fabricius) (1)	Panama
<i>Parides nr lycimenes</i> (1)	Panama
<b>Pieridae</b>	
<i>Phoebis argante</i> (Fabricius) (3)	Panama
<i>Itaballiba demophile centralis</i> Joicey & Talbot (1)	Panama
<b>Nymphalidae</b>	
<i>Archaeoprepona demophoon gulina</i> Fruhstorfer (5)	Panama
<i>Siderone marthesia</i> (Cramer) (1)	Panama
<i>Hypna clytemnestra</i> (Cramer) (4)	Panama
<i>Memphis elara</i> (Godman & Salvin) (1)	Costa Rica
<i>Memphis oenomais</i> (Boisduval) (4)	Panama, Costa Rica
<i>Doxocopa clothilda</i> (Felder) (1)	Costa Rica
<i>Colobura dirce</i> (Linnaeus) (2)	Panama
<i>Historis odius</i> (Fabricius) (1)	Costa Rica
<i>Tigridia acesta</i> (Linnaeus) (1)	Costa Rica
<i>Ectima rectifascia</i> Butler & Druce (2)	Panama
<i>Hamadryas iptheme iptheme</i> Bates (1)	Panama
<i>Dynamine af pierioides</i> (Butler) (1)	Panama
<i>Eunica mira</i> Godman & Salvin (2)	Panama
<i>Eunica mygdonia</i> Godart (1)	Panama
<i>Temenis laothoe agatha</i> (Fabricius) (3)	Panama
<i>Diaethria</i> sp. (4)	Ecuador
<i>Callicore lyca aeries</i> (Godman & Salvin) (3)	Costa Rica
<i>Catonephele mexicana</i> Jenkins (1)	Panama
<i>Adelpha melanthe</i> Bates (6)	Costa Rica
<i>Adelpha leuceria</i> (Druce) (5)	Costa Rica
<i>Adelpha cocala lorzae</i> Boisduval (1)	Panama
<i>Adelpha lerna aeolia</i> (Felder) (1)	Panama
<i>Philaethria dido</i> (Linnaeus) (1)	Panama
<i>Heliconius pacheus</i> Salvin (2)	Costa Rica
<i>Heliconius cydno</i> (various subspecies) (5)	Costa Rica, Colombia
<i>Chlosyne narva</i> (Fabricius) (1)	Costa Rica
<i>Chlosyne lacinia</i> (Geyer) (4)	Panama
<i>Chlosyne janaia</i> (Drury) (4)	USA
<i>Hypocada virginiana evanides</i> (Haensch) (3)	Costa Rica
<i>Mechanitis menapis saturata</i> Godman & Salvin (6)	Costa Rica
<i>Mechanitis polymnia isthmia</i> Bates (4)	Panama
Undetermined genus (1)	Costa Rica
<i>Lycorea cleobaea atergatis</i> Doubleday (1)	Costa Rica
<i>Morpho theseus aquarius</i> Butler (1)	Panama
<i>Morpho peleides limpida</i> Butler (2)	Panama, Costa Rica
<i>Caligo memnon</i> (Felder & Felder) (2)	Panama
<i>Caligo</i> sp. (1)	Panama
<i>Eryphanis</i> sp. (1)	Ecuador
<i>Opsiphanes</i> sp. (1)	Panama
<i>Pierella helvetia incanescens</i> Godman & Salvin (1)	Panama

TABLE 1 — (Continued)

Taxon (number)	Origin
<i>Euptychia westwoodi</i> Butler (>10)	Panama, Costa Rica
<i>Cissia calixta</i> (Butler) (5)	Costa Rica
<i>Cissia hesione</i> (Sulzer) (1)	Panama
<i>Calisto confusa</i> Lathy (1)	Dominican Republic

Sona-Graph 780 with 8 KHz input range, 300 Hz analysis filter, and no attenuation. Except where noted, dominant frequencies and pulse rates were estimated by inspection of sonagrams.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The following individuals helped obtain caterpillars: G. Ballmer, E. Classey, J. Downey, Y. Gamarra, N. Garwood, N. Greig, K. Fiedler, J. Longino, J. Paul, G. Ross, K. Schurian, N. Pierce, and J. Thomas. R. Robbins kindly identified some of the Lycaenidae. Many thanks to P. Harvey and R. May (Oxford), and K. Fiedler and U. Maschwitz (Frankfurt) for their hospitality and lively discussions during my visits. R. Coccoft and S. Rand provided critical assistance in analyzing calls. Special thanks to H. Bennet-Clark for good cheer, consultation, and development of the particle velocity microphone. The manuscript was improved by critiques from R. Hoy, I. J. Kitching, and J. Miller. C. Myers in the Department of Herpetology, American Museum of Natural History, graciously helped with the sonagrams. My deep appreciation to D. Grimaldi, J. Miller, N. Platnick, F. Rindge, and T. Schuh of the Department of Entomology, American Museum of Natural History, for facilitating this and other aspects of my research. Part of this research was funded by a Smithsonian postdoctoral fellowship. Much of my recent work on butterflies has been made possible through a fellowship from the MacArthur Foundation. This study is dedicated to the pioneering work of K. Burrell, G. Evans, P. Martino, and G. Russell.

#### RIODINID AND LYCAENID CALLS

##### SURVEY OF THE RIODINIDAE

Of the 43 riodinid species surveyed, only myrmecophilous caterpillars produced calls

(table 2, figs. 1–4)—except for some *Nymphidium* species (see below). Caterpillars of non-myrmecophilous species did not produce calls (table 3). In general, riodinid calls may be described as a series of rapid, high-pitched chirps, not unlike the scolding semi-click sound used for admonishing naughty children (usually accompanied by a wagging finger)—a rapid “tisch-tisch-tisch. . .”

Following close observation of the caterpillars of *Thisbe irenea*, *Synargis mycone*, *Juditha molpe*, *Nymphidium mantus*, and *Theope nr matuta*, I determined that calling ability began after molting to third instar, a time corresponding to the development of other “ant organs” (DeVries, 1988, 1991a, 1991c). Repeated observations indicated that calling ability continues until immediately preceding pupation, and that caterpillars do not produce calls immediately prior to, during, or after a larval molt. Calls were typically produced when caterpillars were walking or when stressed (e.g., prodded by the observer); except for an occasional chirp, resting caterpillars never called. Caterpillars parasitized by tachinid fly maggots produced calls up to the exit of the parasite from the host’s body.

Call signals were greatly reduced or undetectable when only the posterior segments of the caterpillar were allowed to touch the recording substrate. Despite the apparent monotony of riodinid calls (figs. 3, 4), the call rate varied slightly depending on the activity of an individual caterpillar. For example, walking caterpillars generally had a slower pulse rate than those that were stressed, and some variation was observed between individuals of the same instar (figs. 3A, D, F, I; 4A, D, F, I).

##### VIBRATORY PAPILLAE

A pair of mobile, rodlike appendages arising from the distal edge of segment T-1 was first noted for the myrmecophilous caterpill-

TABLE 2

Species of Riodinid Caterpillars Tested that Produced Calls


(All taxa are in the subfamily Riodininae, and they represent three tribes: Eurybiini, Lemoniini, and Nymphidiini. Classification follows Harvey (1987). An asterisk (\*) immediately following a taxon indicates that the pupa was tested for sound production, and none produced sounds. All of the species listed here are typically myrmecophilous.)

Taxon (number)	Origin
Eurybiini	
<i>Eurybia lycisca</i> Westwood* (8)	Panama, Costa Rica
<i>Eurybia patrona</i> Staudinger (1)	Panama
<i>Eurybia elvina</i> Stichel (2)	Panama
<i>Eurybia</i> sp. (1)	Ecuador
Lemoniini	
<i>Thisbe irenea</i> (Stoll)* (> 30)	Panama, Costa Rica, Belize
<i>Synargis mycone</i> (Hewitson)* (> 10)	Panama, Costa Rica
<i>Synargis gela</i> (Hewitson)* (7)	Ecuador
<i>Juditha molpe</i> (Hübner)* (> 10)	Panama, Costa Rica, Belize
Nymphidiini	
<i>Menander menander</i> (Cramer) (1)	Panama
<i>Calospila cilissa</i> (Hewitson)* (> 10)	Costa Rica
<i>Calospila emylius</i> (Cramer)* (5)	Ecuador
Unknown genus (1)	Panama
<i>Theope</i> nr <i>thestias</i> Hewitson* (7)	Panama
<i>Theope</i> nr <i>matuta</i> Godman & Salvin* (6)	Panama
<i>Theope virgilius</i> (Fabricius)* (4)	Panama
<i>Theope</i> sp. (1)	Panama
<i>Theope</i> nr <i>decorata</i> Godman & Salvin* (> 10)	Costa Rica
<i>Nymphidium</i> sp. (> 10)	Ecuador
<i>Nymphidium mantus</i> (Cramer)* (> 10)	Panama

lars of the genus *Audre* by Bruch (1926) and Borquin (1953). Later these appendages were described in greater detail for a species of *Lemonias* by Ross (1964), who termed them

vibratory papillae. Further studies showed that other riodinid genera also have vibratory papillae (Schremmer, 1978; Callaghan, 1977, 1982, 1986). Along with other myrmecoph-

Fig. 3. Sound spectrograms of last instar caterpillar calls. All caterpillars are Neotropical riodinids unless noted otherwise. The arrow on the X-axis indicates the point of the signal where the wave form recording began (see fig. 4). Each vertical line represents  $\frac{1}{10}$  of 1 sec. A, *Thisbe irenea*, voucher A-1, Panama, with two vibratory papillae; B, *Thisbe irenea*, voucher A-1, 15 min later with one vibratory papilla removed; C, *Thisbe irenea*, voucher A-1, 15 min later with both vibratory papillae removed. The spikes are from the tarsal claws popping off the substrate; D, *Thisbe irenea*, voucher mut-1, Panama, an individual found in nature with no vibratory papillae. The spikes are from the tarsal claws contacting the substrate; E, *Thisbe irenea*, voucher mut-2, Panama, an individual found in nature with no vibratory papillae. The spikes are from the tarsal claws popping off the substrate; F, *Juditha molpe*, voucher A-2, with two vibratory papillae; G, *Juditha molpe*, voucher A-2, 15 min later with one vibratory papilla removed; H, *Juditha molpe*, voucher A-2, 15 min later with both vibratory papillae removed. The spikes are from the tarsal claws popping off the substrate; I, *Juditha molpe*, voucher 22-88, Panama. Note the variance between this individual and that of individual A-2; J, *Theope virgilius*, Panama; K, *Theope* nr *thestias*, voucher 88-12, Panama; L, *Theope* nr *matuta*, voucher 88-21, Panama; M, *Synargis gela*, Ecuador; N, *Synargis mycone*, voucher 88-20, Panama; O, *Calospila emylius*, Ecuador; P, *Calospila cilissa*, Costa Rica; Q, *Nymphidium mantus*, voucher 88-12, Panama; R, *Nymphidium* sp., Ecuador; S, *Leptotes cassius* (Lycaenidae), Florida, USA; T, *Plebulina emigdionis* (Lycaenidae), California, USA.



Time in Seconds

TABLE 3

**Species of Riodinid Caterpillars Tested that Did Not Produce Calls**

(This sample represents two subfamilies, Euselasiinae and Riodininae, and eight tribes: Mesosemiini, incertae sedis, Riodinini, Symmachiini, Charitini, Emesini, and Nymphidiini. Classification follows Harvey (1987). An asterisk (\*) immediately following a taxon indicates the pupa was tested for sound production, and none produced sound. None of the taxa listed here, except the genus *Nymphidium* (see text), typically form symbiosis with ants.)

Taxon (number)	Origin
<b>Euselasiinae</b>	
<i>Euselasia</i> nr <i>leucorrhoea</i> Godman & Salvin* (1)	Panama
<b>Riodininae</b>	
<b>Mesosemiini</b>	
<i>Leucochimona lagora</i> Herrich-Schäffer* (5)	Panama, Costa Rica
<i>Leucochimona</i> sp. (2)	Panama
<i>Leucochimona iphias</i> Stichel (2)	Panama
<i>Mesosemia telegone</i> (Boisduval)* (1)	Panama
<i>Mesosemia</i> sp.* (1)	Ecuador
<b>Insertae Sedis</b>	
<i>Cremna thasus subrutilia</i> Stichel (3)	Panama
<i>Napaea eucharilla rufolimbata</i> Stichel* (1)	Panama
<b>Riodinini</b>	
<i>Ancyluris inca</i> (Saunders)* (> 10)	Panama
<i>Rhetus arcus</i> (Linnaeus) (1)	Panama
<i>Charis gynaea</i> (Godart) (1)	Panama
<i>Caria rhacotis</i> (Godman & Salvin) (3)	Costa Rica
<i>Melanis pixie</i> (Boisduval) (3)	Costa Rica
<b>Symmachiini</b>	
<i>Mesene</i> sp. (1)	Panama
<i>Mesenopsis bryaxis</i> (Hewitson)* (2)	Panama
<i>Esthemopsis sericina</i> Bates* (1)	Panama
<i>Symmachia tricolor</i> Hewitson* (4)	Panama
<b>Charitini</b>	
<i>Sarota gyas</i> (Cramer) (1)	Panama
<i>Anteros formosus micon</i> Druce* (2)	Panama
<b>Emesini</b>	
<i>Emesis tegula</i> (Godman & Salvin) (2)	Costa Rica
<i>Emesis lucinda</i> (Cramer)* (> 10)	Costa Rica
<b>Nymphidiini</b>	
<i>Nymphidium haematostictum</i> Godman & Salvin* (5)	Panama
<i>Nymphidium azanoides occidentalis</i> Callaghan* (> 10)	Panama
<i>Nymphidium cachrus</i> (Fabricius)* (> 10)	Costa Rica
<i>Nymphidium chione onaeum</i> Hewitson (> 10)	Panama
<i>Nymphidium caricae</i> (Linnaeus) (> 10)	Ecuador

ilous organs, the vibratory papillae are considered apomorphic traits for the tribes Lemoniini and Nymphidiini (Harvey, 1987). One reason call signals were reduced or undetectable when only the posterior segments were touching the recording substrate (except in the genus *Eurybia*; see below) is that call-

producing structures are most likely located in the head region (DeVries, 1988).

Ross (1966) first suggested that the beating motion of *Lemonias* vibratory papillae might convey vibrations to ants. Later, DeVries (1988) used the morphology of the vibratory papillae, head movement, and the specialized






Fig. 4. Wave forms of riodinid and lycaenid caterpillar calls. The start of each wave form is marked with an arrow on the X-axis of sonagrams illustrated in fig. 3. Each wave form represents 0.214 sec, and distance between vertical lines represents 8.23 msec. A, *Thisbe irenea*, voucher A-1 with two vibratory papillae; B, *Thisbe irenea*, voucher A-1, 15 min later with one vibratory papilla removed; C, *Thisbe irenea*, voucher A-1, 15 min later with both vibratory papillae removed; D, *Thisbe irenea*, voucher mut-1, an individual found in nature with no vibratory papillae; E, *Thisbe irenea*, Panama, voucher mut 2, an individual found in nature with no vibratory papillae; F, *Juditha molpe*, voucher A-2 with two vibratory papillae; G, *Juditha molpe*, voucher A-2, 15 min later with one vibratory papilla removed; H, *Juditha molpe*, voucher A-2, 15 min later with both vibratory papillae removed; I, *Juditha molpe*, voucher 22-88; J, *Theope virgilius*; K, *Theope nr thestias*; L, *Theope nr. matuta*; M, *Synargis gela*; N, *Synargis mycone*; O, *Calospila emylius*; P, *Calospila cilissa*; Q, *Nymphidium mantus*; R, *Nymphidium* sp.; S, *Leptotes cassius*; T, *Plebulina emigdonis*.

epicranial granulations of *Thisbe irenea* caterpillars as a model of how vibratory papillae might act as components of a stridulatory organ. The model proposed that sound is produced when the head is oscillated, and the ringed shaft of each vibratory papilla grates on the specialized epicranial granulations. Support for this model comes from demonstration that calling ability is eliminated when the vibratory papillae are removed, but re-

turns when they are replaced at the next molt (DeVries, 1990).

Further support for the hypothesis that vibratory papillae are fundamental for call production in some riodinids is presented here. The sequential removal of single vibratory papillae (at 15 min intervals) of *Thisbe irenea* and *Juditha molpe* indicates the relationship between vibratory papillae and call production. Sonagrams (figs. 3A-C, F-H) and wave

forms (figs. 4A–C, F–H) display graphically that as the vibratory papillae are removed, the pulse train and wave form of the call decay sequentially until the only signal produced is that of the tarsal claws “popping” off the substrate while the caterpillars are walking. Two individual *T. irenea* caterpillars were found in nature without vibratory papillae (figs. 3D, E; 4D, E; 5E). Their signals mirror those of the individual caterpillar that had both its vibratory papillae removed experimentally (figs. 3C, H; 4C, H).

Previous studies (Bruch, 1926; Borquin, 1953; Ross, 1964; Schremmer, 1978; Callaghan, 1977, 1982, 1986; Harvey, 1987; DeVries 1988), together with the present one (figs. 5, 6), indicate that the usual complement of vibratory papillae is two per caterpillar. However, a large sample of Panamanian *Thisbe irenea* caterpillars ( $N > 200$ ) yielded one individual with three vibratory papillae (two on one side and one on the other), and another two individuals without vibratory papillae (fig. 5E). Further, in the last three instars of four caterpillars (*Theope* nr. *matura*) each individual had a total of six vibratory papillae—a pair with three shafts per attachment point (fig. 5M). Thus, exceptions to the standard complement can occur.

My taxonomic survey indicates that vibratory papillae divide roughly into two morphological types: (1) those that have annulations distributed evenly along the distal  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the shaft and with the cusp surfaces radiating out from the central axes; and (2) those with annulations of varying widths generally confined to the distal third and with the cusps directed in either an anterior or posterior direction. In the second type, the papillae are clubbed distally. The first type was found in species of *Thisbe*, *Juditha*, *Synargis*, *Calospila*, and *Menander* (fig. 5), while the second type was found in species of *Theope* and *Nymphidium* (figs. 5M, O, P; 6A–D). Other types of vibratory papillae may be found as more species of caterpillars become available for study.

#### EPICRANIAL GRANULATIONS

The epicranial surface where the vibratory papillae strike the head is covered with specialized granulations of differing types (figs.

5B–P; 6A–D). The granulations may consist of: (1) irregular rows of sharp, roughly conical granulations that project forward (*Thisbe*, *Synargis*), (2) longitudinally flattened disks that are directed slightly forward (*Calospila*), (3) sharp, erect wedges with the bases buttressed on two sides (*Menander*), (4) a raised, pointed edge with heavy buttressing at the posterior edge of the base (*Nymphidium mantus*, *Theope*), or (5) blunt hemispheres (*Nymphidium*). Only members of the Lemoniini and Nymphidiini had vibratory papillae and specialized epicranial granulations. All other riordinid genera surveyed (excepting *Eurybia*) had a smooth epicranium and no vibratory papillae (fig. 6G–L). Such species typically do not form symbioses with ants.

There are two exceptions to the association between having vibratory papillae and epicranial granulations, and producing calls. First, myrmecophilous caterpillars of the genus *Eurybia* produce distinct calls, yet do not possess vibratory papillae or granulations on the epicranium (fig. 6E, F). Second, five species of the genus *Nymphidium* were found to be unable to produce calls, even though they possess vibratory papillae and epicranial granulations (table 1; fig. 6A–D). Both of these genera are discussed below.

#### DESCRIPTIONS OF RIORDINID CALLS

*Eurybia*: All four species produce a consistent pulse train of “eh-eh-eh-eh...” with a short silence between pulses; mean pulse rate ( $N = 4$ ) of 12–15 pulses/sec. No head oscillation was observed in any species, and none had vibratory papillae or specialized epicranial granulations (fig. 6E, F). Details of the calls will be reported elsewhere (DeVries, in prep.).

*Thisbe irenea* (figs. 1, 3A–E, 4A–E): A strong series of rapid, twittering chirps that inflect upward at the end of the pulse train; a mean pulse rate of ( $N = 30$ ) 16.5 pulses/sec, mean dominant frequency  $\approx 900$  Hz [range  $\approx 370$ –1500Hz].

*Synargis mycone* (figs. 3N, 4N): A strong series of fluttery, squeaky chirps; mean pulse rate of ( $N = 6$ ) 34 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1840$  Hz [range  $\approx 1120$ –3000 Hz].




Fig. 5. Scanning electron micrographs of riodinid caterpillars showing vibratory papillae and the epicranial surface where the vibratory papillae strike. A, Frontal view of *Synargis gela* head showing typical position of the vibratory papillae (scale bar = 200  $\mu$ m). B, Detail of a *Synargis gela* vibratory papilla and epicranial granulations (scale bar = 20  $\mu$ m). C, Lateral view of *Synargis mycone* epicranium showing a vibratory papilla and epicranial granulations (scale bar = 50  $\mu$ m). D, *Synargis mycone* head granulations (scale bar = 5  $\mu$ m). E, Frontal view of the head of an individual *Thisbe irenea* found in nature without vibratory papillae developed (scale bar = 500  $\mu$ m). F, Epicranial granulations of *Thisbe irenea* (scale bar = 20  $\mu$ m). Note annulations of the vibratory papilla in extreme upper left. G, A vibratory papilla of *Juditha molpe* and epicranial granulations (scale bar = 50  $\mu$ m). H, *Juditha molpe* head granulations (scale bar = 10  $\mu$ m). Note shaft of vibratory papilla in extreme upper right corner. I, Dorsal third of head of *Calospila emylius* showing both vibratory papillae. Note location of patch of epicranial granulations (scale bar = 50  $\mu$ m). J, *Calospila cilissa* vibratory papilla and epicranial granulations (scale bar = 20  $\mu$ m). K, Details of *Calospila cilissa* epicranial granulations (scale bar = 10  $\mu$ m). L, *Menander menander* epicranial granulations. Note shaft of vibratory papilla at top of figure (scale bar = 20  $\mu$ m). M, One set of *Theope nr matuta* vibratory papillae. Unlike all other known species, *T. nr matuta* has two sets of three. N, Details of *Theope nr matuta* head granulations (scale bar = 5  $\mu$ m). O, *Theope nr thestias* vibratory papilla and epicranial granulations (scale bar = 20  $\mu$ m). P, Detail of *Theope nr thestias* vibratory papilla and head granulations. Note cusps on vibratory papilla are directed posterior (scale bar = 5  $\mu$ m).




Fig. 6. Details of riodinid vibratory papillae and epicranium. A, Vibratory papilla of *Nymphidium mantus* and epicranial granulations (scale bar = 10  $\mu$ m). B, Vibratory papilla of *Nymphidium haematostictum* (scale bar = 10  $\mu$ m). Note that the head capsule is pulled away from the normal position. C, Detail of *Nymphidium haematostictum* epicranial granulations (scale bar = 10  $\mu$ m). D, Vibratory papilla and epicranial granulations of *Nymphidium azanoides* (scale bar = 20  $\mu$ m). Note that the area where vibratory papilla strikes is clogged with shrublike setae which presumably interfere with call production. E, An overview of the head of *Eurybia patrona*. Note absence of vibratory papillae (scale bar = 200  $\mu$ m). F, Detail of *Eurybia patrona* epicranium showing a sparsely pebbled surface of hemispherical granulations (scale bar = 20  $\mu$ m). G, Frontal view of *Cremna thasus* head. There are no vibratory papillae, only long setae (scale bar = 200  $\mu$ m). H, Detail of the smooth epicranium of *Cremna thasus* (scale bar = 50  $\mu$ m). I, Dorsal view of *Emesis lucinda* head. There are no vibratory papillae (scale bar = 100  $\mu$ m). J, Detail of the smooth epicranium of *Emesis lucinda* (scale bar = 10  $\mu$ m). K, Frontal view of *Ancyluris inca* head. There are no vibratory papillae, only long setae (scale bar = 200  $\mu$ m). L, Detail of the smooth epicranium of *Ancyluris inca* (scale bar = 5  $\mu$ m).

*Synargis gela* (figs. 3M, 4M): An irregular, short series of rasping chirps that inflect upward at the end of the pulse train; mean pulse rate of (N = 6) 15.2 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx$  1677 Hz [range  $\approx$  940–4000 Hz].

*Juditha molpe* (figs. 3F–I, 4F–I): A strong series of rapid, twittering chirps with a short silence between each pulse train; mean pulse rate of (N = 6) 15.2 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx$  2192 Hz [range  $\approx$  720–2020 Hz].

*Menander menander*: A strong series of

rasping chirps similar to those of *Synargis*. No detailed analyses were performed.

*Calospila cilissa* (figs. 3P, 4P): An infrequent series of chirps that sound like audible “kissing”; mean pulse rate of 6 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx$  1700 Hz [range  $\approx$  500–3500 Hz].

*Calospila emylius* (figs. 3O, 4O): An irregular series of “smooching” chirps that inflect upward at the end of the pulse train; mean pulse rate of (N = 6) 9.5 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency of  $\approx$  2550 Hz [range  $\approx$  1980–4000 Hz].

TABLE 4

Species of Lycaenid Caterpillars Tested that Produced Calls

(This sample represents three subfamilies, Theclinae, Lycaeninae, and Polyommatinae, and five tribes: Eumaeini, Hypolycaenini, Zesiini, Lycaenini, and Polyommatinini. Classification follows Eliot (1973). All of the species listed here are found in symbioses with ants.)

Taxon (number)		Origin
Theclinae		
Eumaeini		
<i>Chlorostrymon simaethis</i> (Drury) (> 10)		Panama
<i>Strymon yojoa</i> Reakirt (3)		Panama, Costa Rica
<i>Arawacus lincoides</i> Draught (> 10)		Panama, Costa Rica
<i>Olynthus narbal</i> (Stoll) (8)		Panama
<i>Thereus pedusa</i> (Hewitson) (> 10)		Panama
<i>Thereus nr enenia</i> (Hewitson) (1)		Panama
<i>Panthiades bitias</i> (Cramer) (1)		Panama
<i>Rekoa palegon</i> (Cramer) (1)		Panama
<i>Tmolus echion</i> (Linnaeus) (6)		Costa Rica
<i>Micandra platyptera</i> (Felder & Felder) (2)		Costa Rica
<i>Thecla legytha</i> (Hewitson) (2)		Panama
<i>Thecla</i> sp. (1)		Costa Rica
Hypolycaenini		
<i>Hypolycaena erylus</i> (Godart) (1)		Thailand
Zesiini		
<i>Jalmenus evagoras</i> (Donovan) (4)		Australia
Lycaeninae		
<i>Lycaena phaleas</i> Linnaeus (6)		Germany
<i>Lycaena hippothoe</i> Linnaeus (4)		Germany
Polyommatinae		
Polyommatinini		
<i>Leptotes cassius</i> (Cramer) (3)		USA
<i>Cupido minimus</i> Fuessly (7)		England, Germany
<i>Maculinea arion</i> Linnaeus (2)		Poland
<i>Maculinea nausithaus</i> Bergstrasser (2)		Germany
<i>Maculinea teleius</i> Bergstrasser (3)		Germany
<i>Maculinea rebeli</i> Hirschke (2)		France
<i>Maculinea alcon</i> Schiffermuller (2)		France
<i>Plebulina emigdionis</i> (Grinnell) (1)		USA
<i>Lycaeides melissa samuelis</i> Nabokov (1)		USA
<i>Lysandra coridon caelestissima</i> Verity (> 10)		Spain
<i>Lysandra hispana</i> Herrich-Schaffer (5)		Spain, France
<i>Lysandra bellargus</i> Rottemburg (> 10)		England, France
<i>Polyommatus icarus</i> Rottemburg (6)		England, Germany

Unknown genus (Nymphidiini) carnivorous on scale insects: A pulse series of fluttery, squeaky chirps, not unlike that of *Synargis mycone*; mean pulse rate of (N = 1) 16.6 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx$  2400 Hz [range  $\approx$  1940–3000 Hz].

*Theope thestias* (figs. 3K, 4K): A regular series of thin, watery sounding chirps; mean pulse rate of (N = 2) 7 pulses/sec; mean dom-

inant frequency  $\approx$  1875 Hz [range  $\approx$  1750–2000 Hz].

*Theope nr matuta* (figs. 3L, 4L): A series of guttural, grating chirps; a short silence between each pulse train; mean pulse rate of (N = 4) 48 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx$  2000 Hz [range  $\approx$  1400–2900 Hz].

*Theope virgilius* (figs. 3J, 4J): A fluttering series of oscillating, watery chirps; mean pulse

TABLE 5

**Species of Lycaenid Caterpillars Tested that Did Not Produce Calls**

All species are in the subfamily Theclinae, tribe Eumaeini. Classification follows Eliot (1973). None of the species listed here typically form symbioses with ants.

Taxon (number)	Origin
Theclinae	
Eumaeini	
<i>Eumaeus godartii</i> (Boisduval) (> 20)	Panama, Costa Rica
<i>Symbiopsis tanais</i> (Godman & Salvin) (3)	Panama
<i>Pseudolycaena damo</i> (Druce) (2)	Panama
<i>Thecla barajo</i> (Reakirt) (1)	Costa Rica
<i>Thecla</i> nr <i>melma</i> Schaus (12)	Costa Rica
<i>Thecla hisbon</i> (Godman & Salvin) (> 10)	Panama

rate of (N = 3) 39 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx$  2000 Hz [range  $\approx$  1400–3000 Hz].

*Theope* sp.: A constant, fluttering series of watery chirps; mean pulse rate of (N = 1) 47 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx$  1650 Hz [range  $\approx$  1080–2220 Hz].

*Theope* nr *decorata*: A weak and infrequent chirping pulse of “chit-chit-chit” with silent sections between the pulse trains. Not analyzed in detail.

*Nymphidium* sp. (figs. 2, 3R, 4R): A strong, consistent series of grating chirps that sound as though someone were slowly bending a large section of sheet metal; mean pulse rate of (N = 5) 16 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx$  2000 Hz [range  $\approx$  1580–2600 Hz].


*Nymphidium mantus* (figs. 3Q; 4Q): A regular series of grating chirps that sound similar to the call of a scolding squirrel; mean pulse rate of (N = 2 in detail) 46 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx$  2000 Hz [range  $\approx$  940–3300 Hz].

**SURVEY OF THE LYCAENIDAE**

All but 6 of the 36 species of Lycaenidae surveyed (tables 4, 5) produced a call that was detectable when any part of a caterpillar was touching the recording substrate. The ability to produce calls probably has its onset at the instar when the other ant organs develop (usually the third). However, the possibility that earlier instars do call cannot be eliminated because only caterpillars of third or later instars were tested. Third and post-third instar caterpillars produced calls when moving or feeding (but not when resting). Caterpillars that were parasitized by tachinid maggots also produced calls. No call was detected immediately prior to or after a molt in any caterpillar. Depending on the recording circumstances and the physiological state of the individual caterpillars, call pulse rates varied both within and between individuals and taxa.

Unlike the relatively uniform sounds produced by lycaenid pupae (see Hinton, 1948;

Fig. 7. Sound spectrograms of caterpillar calls and pupal stridulations. All are from the family Lycaenidae. Each sonagram represents 1 sec of signal; vertical lines represent  $\frac{1}{10}$  of 1 sec. The arrow on the X-axis indicates the point where the wave form recording began (see fig. 8). All caterpillar calls were recorded from last instar larvae unless noted otherwise. A, *Thereus pedusa* caterpillar, Panama; B, *Thereus pedusa* pupa, Panama; C, *Strymon simaethis* caterpillar, Panama; D, *Strymon simaethis* pupa, Panama; E, *Thereus* nr *enenia* caterpillar, Panama; F, *Arawacus lincoides* caterpillar, Costa Rica; G, *Olynthus narbal* caterpillar, Panama; H, *Strymon yojoa* caterpillar, Panama; I, *Panhiades bitias* caterpillar, Panama; J, *Polyommatus icarus* caterpillar, England; K, *Lysandra bellargus* caterpillar, southern France; L, *Lysandra hispana* caterpillar, Southern France; M, *Lysandra hispana* caterpillar, Spain, Barcelona; N, *Maculineaalcon* caterpillar, France; O, *Maculineaalcon* pupa, France; P, *Lysandra coridon caelestissima* caterpillar, Spain; Q, *Lycaena hippothoe* caterpillar, Westerwald, Germany; R, *Lycaena phaleas* caterpillar, Westerwald, Germany; S, *Jalmenus evagoras* caterpillar, Queensland, Australia; T, *Jalmenus evagoras* pupa, Queensland, Australia.



Time in Seconds




Fig. 8. Wave forms of caterpillar calls. The start of each wave form is marked with an arrow head on the X-axis of sonagrams illustrated in fig. 7. Each wave form represents 0.214 sec, and distance between vertical lines represents 8.23  $\mu$ sec. A, *Thereus pedusa* caterpillar; B, *Thereus pedusa* pupa; C, *Strymon simaethis* caterpillar; D, *Strymon simaethis* pupa; E, *Thereus nr enenia*; F, *Arawacus lincoides*; G, *Olynthus narbal*; H, *Strymon yojoa*; I, *Panthiades bitias*; J, *Polyommatus icarus*; K, *Lysandra bel-largus*; L, *Lysandra hispanus*; M, *Lysandra hispanus*; N, *Maculineaalcon* caterpillar; O, *Maculineaalcon* pupa; P, *Lysandra coridon*; Q, *Lycaena hippothoe*; R, *Lycaena phaleas*; S, *Jalmenus evagoras* larva; T, *Jalmenus evagoras* pupa.

Hoegh-Guldberg, 1972; Downey and Allyn 1973, 1979; Ellferich, 1988; figs. 7B, D, O, T; personal obs.), the sounds produced by lycaenid caterpillars are remarkably variable. For example, depending on the species, the calls may be described as: reminiscent of the throaty trills of chorusing toads (e.g., *Bufo*); a rhythmic "ah-ah-ah"; a grating crunch; or the whirring made by a small clockwork toy. Some species produced two distinct sounds simultaneously. Lycaenid caterpillars do not possess vibratory papillae (Cottrell, 1984; Harvey, 1987; Ballmer and Platt, 1988) or

specialized epicranial structures, and they do not exhibit head oscillation behavior (personal obs.). They therefore must produce calls by different, as yet unknown means (see below).

#### DESCRIPTIONS OF LYCAENID CALLS

*Chlorostrymon simaethis* (figs. 7C, 8C): The caterpillar call has two components; a growling background with a wobbly, but consistent "beep-ahh-ahh-ahh, beep-ahh-ahh-ahh. . .";



mean pulse rate of ( $N = 4$ ) 28 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1500$  Hz [range  $\approx 1300$ – $1700$  Hz]. The pupa (figs. 7D, 8D) produces an irregular series of metallic clicks, with periods of silence between pulses; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 14 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 2290$  Hz [range  $\approx 1820$ – $2760$  Hz].

*Strymon yojoa* (figs. 7H, 8H): A constant pulse train that sounds like a metallic “fluttering of the tongue”; mean pulse rate of ( $N = 1$ ) 15 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 700$  Hz [range  $\approx 540$ – $830$  Hz].

*Arawacus lincoides* (figs. 7F, 8H): A growling background with a pulse series of “bup-bup-bup. . .”; mean pulse rate of ( $N = 5$ ) 13 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 700$  Hz [range  $\approx 300$ – $1300$  Hz].

*Olynthus narbal* (figs. 7G, 8G): A series of creaky, staccato trills of “duh-duh-duh-duh. . .”; mean pulse rate of ( $N = 3$ ) 17 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 700$  Hz [range  $\approx 300$ – $1500$  Hz].

*Thereus pedusa* (figs. 7A; 8A): The caterpillar produces a vigorous and consistent growling background with a series of strong pulses, “bup-bup-bup. . .” that sound like a one-cylinder engine that fires only occasionally; mean pulse rate of ( $N = 4$ ) 36 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 550$  Hz [range  $\approx 350$ – $730$  Hz]. The pupa (figs. 7B; 8B) produces two sounds—a consistent background whirring and occasional metallic chirps; pulse rate ( $N = 2$ ) 19 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1970$  Hz [range  $\approx 1400$ – $2480$  Hz]. *Note:* According to my field-notes, a mature caterpillar placed in a small, thin-walled plastic container produced a “faint, rhythmic bumping noise.” This indicates that at least part of the call is airborne.

*Thereus nr enenia* (figs. 7E, 8E): A strong drumming series of “bup-bup-bup. . .” (like the calls of *Bufo marinus* toads); mean pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 10 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1600$  Hz [range  $\approx 900$ – $2300$  Hz].

*Panthiades bitias* (figs. 7I, 8I): A consistent series of evenly spaced drumming, “ooh-ooh-ooh-ooh. . .”; mean pulse rate ( $N = 2$ ) 13 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 890$  Hz [range  $\approx 520$ – $1250$  Hz].

*Thecla legytha*: The call has two compo-

nents; a growling background and a series of barks that sound like bup-bup-bup. . .”; mean pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 17 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1600$  Hz [range  $\approx 960$ – $2280$  Hz].

*Rekoa palegon*: Call similar to *Thecla legytha*; mean pulse rate ( $N = 3$ ) 17 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 700$  Hz [range  $\approx 300$ – $1500$  Hz].

*Tmolus echion*: An infrequent series of “ah-ah, ah-ah. . .”; mean pulse rate ( $N = 6$ ) 12 pulses/sec. Call not analyzed in detail.

*Micandra platyptera*: An infrequent “bup-bup-bup. . .” that is repeated sporadically; mean pulse rate ( $N = 2$ ) 11 pulses/sec. Call not analyzed in detail.

*Hypolycaena erylius*: A constant nasal “yuh-yuh-yuh-yuh. . .”; termination of each individual pulse inflects upward; mean pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 4 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1400$  Hz [range  $\approx 300$ – $2500$  Hz].

*Jalmenus evagoras* (figs. 7S; 8S): The caterpillar call is a constant “khen-khen-khen-khen. . .”; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 7 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1700$  Hz [range  $\approx 500$ – $3000$  Hz]. The pupa (figs. 7T; 8T) produces a series of metallic clicklike pulses, “kih-kih-kih-kih. . .,” with periods of silence between pulses; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 7.5 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 2300$  Hz [range  $1500$ – $3100$  Hz].

*Lycaena phaleas* (figs. 7R; 8R): The call has two components: a background that sounds like twisting a rubber balloon between one's hands, and a series of dominant “crunches” that appear at the end of each pulse train; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 20 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1500$  Hz [range  $\approx 500$ – $3600$  Hz].

*Lycaena hippothoe* (figs. 7Q; 8Q): The call has two components; a ticking background, and a discrete, irregular series of dominant “bih-dup, bih-dup” pulses; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 8 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1400$  Hz [range  $\approx 500$ – $3500$  Hz]. Calls much less frequently than does *L. phaleas*.

*Leptotes cassius* (figs. 3S; 4S): The call has two components; a ticking background and an irregular, galloping series of trills, “bih-dup bih-dup bih-dup. . .,” that gather momentum toward the end of the pulse train; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 5 pulses/sec; mean dom-

inant frequency  $\approx 1500$  Hz [range  $\approx 500$ – $3000$  Hz].

*Cupido minimus*: The call is a constant series of repeated, stuttering “ah ah ah ah ah,” a short interval of silence, then a repeated “ah ah ah ah ah”; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 8 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1200$  Hz [range  $\approx 500$ – $2000$  Hz].

*Maculinea alcon* (figs. 7N; 8N): The caterpillar call has two components: a growling background, and a consistent, but wobbly series of “dik-a dik-a, dik-a, dik-a. . .”; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 12 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 350$  Hz [range  $\approx 100$ – $2500$  Hz]. The pupa produces a regular pulse train of “keh-keh-keh-keh. . .” terminating in a rattlelike pulse at the end of each series with a space between each pulse train (figs. 7O; 8O). A summary and analysis of *Maculinea* species and their attending ants will be presented elsewhere (DeVries et al., in prep.).

*Plebulina emigdionis* (figs. 3T; 4T): The call is an irregular, repeated series of “bi-da-da-dup. . .” with an upward inflection at the “dup,” and a short silent interval between pulses; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 6 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 500$  Hz [range  $\approx 200$ – $800$  Hz].

*Lycaeides melissa samuelis*: An infrequent series of chirps; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 4 pulses/sec with long intervals ( $\approx 2$  sec) between signals. The caterpillar calls infrequently. Not analyzed in detail.

*Lysandra coridon* (figs. 7P, 8P): A strong whimpering pulse train of “eh-eh-eh-eh. . .” (like a petulant child) that ascends in strength at the end of the pulse train (like toads trilling in the distance), and a short interval of silence between each pulse; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 13 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1200$  Hz [range  $\approx 500$ – $2000$  Hz].

*Lysandra hispana* (figs. 7M, 8M): A caterpillar from Barcelona produced a consistent whimpering pulse, similar to that of *L. bellargus*, but ascending in strength at the end of each pulse train; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 15 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1200$  Hz [range  $\approx 100$ – $2000$  Hz].

*Lysandra hispana* (figs. 7L, 8L): A caterpillar from France produced a strong, regular fluttering wheeze of pulses that “run out of air” at the end of each pulse train, and are separated by a short silence; pulse rate ( $N =$

1) 15 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1400$  Hz [range  $\approx 500$ – $3000$  Hz].

*Lysandra bellargus* (figs. 7K, 8K): A constant series of whimpering pulses “eh-eh-eh-eh. . .” (as a petulant child might make), with a short interval of silence between each pulse; each individual pulse sounds as though it has some reverberation in it (like toads trilling in the distance); pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 10 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 500$  Hz [range  $\approx 300$ – $700$  Hz].

*Polyommatus icarus* (figs. 7J, 8J): A constant drumming series of “ba-da-da-dup, ba-da-da-dup. . .” that ends abruptly at an upward inflection point, and with a short silent interval between each trill; pulse rate ( $N = 1$ ) 11 pulses/sec; mean dominant frequency  $\approx 1500$  Hz [range  $\approx 300$ – $3000$  Hz].

#### SUMMARY OF RIODINID CALLS

Forty-four species of riodinid caterpillars from two subfamilies and nine tribes were surveyed for their ability to produce calls. Only 19 species from three tribes were shown to produce a call, and all 19 are myrmecophilous (tables 2–3). Removal of the vibratory papillae rendered caterpillars mute, and acoustic profiles for those are similar to caterpillars found in nature without vibratory papillae (figs. 3A–E). Thus, vibratory papillae are fundamental for call production (DeVries, 1988, 1990, figs. 3A–E, F–I; 4A–E, F–I).

Possession of vibratory papillae is considered a synapomorphy of the tribes Lemoniini and Nymphidiini (Harvey 1987). Thus, I expected that all caterpillars from these tribes would produce calls (DeVries, 1990). However, some caterpillars in the genus *Nymphidium* that possess vibratory papillae and epicranial granulae, and that exhibit head oscillation behavior, were found to be mute (table 3). This is probably because in these species, the epicranial granulations are reduced (fig. 6A–C), and there is a dense covering of mushroomlike setae on the epicranium (fig. 6D) that may prevent the vibratory papillae from contacting the epicranial granulations. Two species of *Nymphidium*, however, produced typical calls (table 2; figs. 3Q, R; 4Q, R). *Nymphidium* is apparently the only riodinid genus known where the possession

of vibratory papillae is not correlated with the ability to produce calls. Thus, it is important that we examine the caterpillars of other genera of the Nymphidiini (i.e., *Parnes*, *Periplacis*, *Zelotaea*, *Pandemos*, *Dysmathia*, *Hypophylla*, *Calliona*, *Rodinia*, *Adelotypa*, *Echenais*, *Calociasma*, *Setabis*) for the presence of mushroomlike setae on the epicranium, and for the ability to produce calls.

The caterpillars of all Eurybiini (*Eurybia*, *Alesa*, and *Mimocastnia*) are expected to possess myrmecophilous secretory organs, but not vibratory papillae (Harvey, 1987). In addition to lacking vibratory papillae, I found that *Eurybia* caterpillars do not have highly developed epicranial granulations (fig. 6E, F), and that they do not oscillate the head while calling. Since *Eurybia* caterpillars do call, this suggests that the ability to call has evolved at least twice within the Riodinidae. Two hypotheses might explain how calls are produced by *Eurybia* caterpillars: (1) the tiny bumps on the epicranium may grate on the distal edge of segment T-1 (although without obvious head movement this is unlikely), and (2) the call may be produced in a manner similar to the "shivering" in lycaenids (see below). A comparative study of the epicranial morphology, behavior, and calling ability in *Eurybia*, *Alesa*, and *Mimocastnia* may provide insight into the evolution of calling by riodinid caterpillars.

#### SUMMARY OF LYCAENID CALLS

Thirty species of lycaenid caterpillars, representing three subfamilies and five tribes, were found to produce calls, and all were species that associate with ants (table 4). Only six nonmyrmecophilous species (Theclinae, Eumaeini) were not observed to produce calls (table 5). The mechanism for lycaenid call production is unknown (see below), but riodinid and lycaenid myrmecophilous organs are not homologous (DeVries, 1988, 1991). This implies that calling ability in these butterfly groups is not homologous, but has evolved independently in these two families (DeVries, 1990, 1991a).

The only biogeographic area where calling by lycaenid caterpillars remains unknown is Africa (DeVries, 1990, tables 4–5). However, a posthumously published letter written in

Nigeria in 1917, suggests that C. O. Farquharson (1921: 376–377) was the first to detect lycaenid caterpillar calls. My annotations are in brackets:

... in handling one of these [caterpillars], I suddenly was conscious of a curious sensation in my finger and thumb which is very difficult of description. As near as possible it reminded me of a very faint electric shock, not accompanied by prickly sensation but rather as if one were being tickled by a tiny brush of slightly strong bristles. [The species of this caterpillar was never identified. However, he then describes a different caterpillar, *Tanuetheria timon* Fabricius, as] I myself believe it to be electrical. I find it hard to say why, except it reminds me of nothing so much as the queer "internal" tickling that a faint discharge produces.

Eltringham (1921) found no electrical tissue in Farquharson's preserved caterpillars, but suggested that muscular contractions could have produced the "electrical sensation." Upon examining a live British lycaenid caterpillar [*Strymonidia pruni* Linnaeus] Eltringham commented (p. 485) that the caterpillar, "... did in fact shiver at short intervals. The movement was not sufficiently rapid to produce an electrical sensation, but it at least demonstrated that such muscular vibrations are possible." After listening to many calls, I find Eltringham's phrase "a shiver at short intervals" to be a useful description of the pulse trains produced by lycaenid caterpillars (figs. 3S, T; 5). Thus, on the strength of Farquharson's observations, Eltringham's description, and the taxonomic breadth of the survey here (table 4), I am confident that myrmecophilous African lycaenid caterpillars will be found to produce calls. In fact, this prediction was recently fortified when I found that the caterpillars of a lycaenid from Madagascar (tentatively identified as the genus *Hemiolaus*) produced calls.

I have observed the shivering behavior described by Eltringham (1921) in caterpillars of *Thereus pedusa*, *Arawacus lincoides*, *Jalmenus evagoras*, and *Lysandra bellargus*. Hence I believe that rapid muscular contractions are in some way fundamental to lycaenid caterpillar call production—even though my attempts to find sound-producing organs through dissection have failed. Answering two fundamental questions will provide a fuller understanding of the evolution of lycaenid calls, and will determine the course for future study: (1) What are the mecha-

nism(s) for production of caterpillars calls? and (2) Did the ability to produce caterpillar calls arise once or several times in the Lycaenidae?

#### COMPARISON OF LYCAENID AND RIODINID CALLS

To the human ear riodinid calls sound fast and "chirpy" while those of lycaenids sound like a slow "drumming." These differences are reflected in the verbal descriptions provided above. Overall, riodinid calls (14 species) show a mean dominant frequency of 1877.21 Hz (SE = 107.6; range 900–2550 Hz), and a mean pulse rate of 23.36 pulses/sec (SE = 4.21; range 6–48, while lycaenid calls (21 species) show a mean dominant frequency of 1085.24 Hz (SE = 96.42; range 500–1700 Hz) and a mean pulse rate of 13.76 pulses/sec (SE = 1.65; range 4–36). A comparison demonstrated that riodinid and lycaenid calls (one-way ANOVA) differ significantly both in mean dominant frequency ( $F[1] = 28.92, p < .0001$ ) and in pulse rate ( $F[1] = 5.83, p < .025$ ). Hence, riodinid calls sound "chirpy" simply because they tend to have a high dominant frequency and a fast pulse rate.

#### FUNCTION AND INFORMATION CONTENT OF CALLS

At least three lines of evidence suggest that caterpillar calls evolved in the context of ant symbioses. First, only myrmecophilous taxa are known to produce calls (tables 1–5). Second, the caterpillars that called also possessed secretory organs thought to be important in forming symbioses with ants (see Cottrell, 1984; Harvey, 1987; DeVries, 1988, 1991a; Ballmer and Platt, 1988). Finally, caterpillars gain protection against enemies by associating with ants (Pierce et al., 1987; DeVries, 1991c), and calling caterpillars can accrue and maintain the presence of more ants than those that are rendered mute (DeVries, 1990). Collectively these observations provide compelling support for the idea that caterpillar calls evolved only in the context of forming and maintaining symbioses with ants (figs. 1–2).

The range of frequencies found in caterpillar calls (300–3000 Hz) include frequencies that are known to travel considerable distances through appropriate substrate, and

that are used by some insects in substrate-borne communication systems (Michelsen and Nocke, 1974; Gogala, 1985). In view of the fact that ants produce substrate-borne stridulations, and that co-workers respond positively to them (Markl and Hölldobler, 1978; Baroni-Urbani et al., 1988), it is likely that ants also respond to the calls of caterpillars (DeVries, 1990). Although the distance that caterpillar calls can travel through natural substrates is unknown, it may be a considerable distance; calls can travel the full length of a wooden meter stick (DeVries, unpubl.). Experiments designed to test the responses of ants to substrate-borne caterpillar calls are planned for the future, and will be reported elsewhere (DeVries, in prep.).

Insect calls have, in general, evolved to attract members of the same species (e.g., Alexander, 1962; Ewing, 1984; Dambach, 1989). It is therefore tempting to speculate that in the system described here, caterpillar calls may have evolved under selection for symbiosis to attract specific ant taxa. However, there is no evidence to suggest that such evolution has occurred. An analysis of the frequencies and pulse rates of *Maculinea* caterpillar calls showed little or no similarity to the stridulatory calls of the *Myrmica* ant species that tend them (DeVries et al., in prep.), even though *Maculinea* caterpillars are involved in obligate, species-specific associations with their host ants (Thomas et al., 1989). While some frequencies may eventually be found more attractive to ants than others, the most likely general hypothesis for the "information content" of caterpillar calls is simply that a constant, rhythmic call produces a positive, investigative response in ants. Once an ant has been attracted to a caterpillar, the secretory organs and specialized behaviors (Cottrell, 1984; DeVries, 1988; Fiedler and Maschwitz, 1988, 1989) in concert with calling may further induce the ant to maintain association with the caterpillar (DeVries, 1988, 1990).

#### SOUNDS PRODUCED BY PUPAE

Riodinid pupae are known to have intersegmental plates and files like those found in lycaenid pupae, and in both groups these are considered to act as a stridulatory mechanism

(Downey and Allyn 1973). Stridulation in lycaenid pupae is well documented (Hinton, 1948; Hoegh-Guldberg, 1972; Downey and Allyn, 1973, 1978; Elfferich, 1988; figs. 7B, D, O, T; 8B, D, O, T). Although it has been assumed that riodinid pupae produce sounds, there are no data to support this. Over a three-year period I surveyed the pupae of 26 riodinid species from two subfamilies and nine tribes for sound production (tables 2, 3). Surprisingly, I found no evidence that riodinid pupae produce sounds, even when I employed a particle velocity microphone. In view of these results, previous suggestions that pupal sound production is a universal trait among riodinids, and that it functions in myrmecophily or as a general defense (Ross, 1966; Downey and Allyn, 1973; Ellferich, 1988) need to be reevaluated.

#### FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

The observations described here provide a basis for predicting where to search for calling ability in butterfly caterpillars and other insects. In riodinids, only members of the tribes Eurybiini, Lemoniini and Nymphidiini produce calls (tables 2–3). Thus, it is likely that caterpillars of all non-myrmecophilous riodinid taxa will be found to be mute. For the Lycaenidae we have information for only five tribes and three subfamilies (tables 4, 5) of the eight subfamilies and 29 tribes proposed by Eliot (1973). Unfortunately, few data are available that address whether particular lycaenid taxa are typically myrmecophilous or not, especially among tropical groups. Hence, predicting which lycaenid taxa will produce calls is problematical. However, based on descriptions of Lipteninae and Poritiinae caterpillars (Clark and Dickson, 1971; Eliot, 1973; Cottrell, 1984), these are similar to nonmyrmecophilous riodinids (DeVries, 1991a), making it probable that their caterpillars are mute.

The ability to produce substrate-borne calls appears to be widespread among myrmecophilous butterfly caterpillars. With this system as a model, there is now a precedent to look for calling ability in other groups of insects that associate with ants. For example, given the propensity of Homoptera to produce calls (Ossiannilsson, 1949; Claridge

1985), and for some to form symbioses with ants (Way, 1963), the possibility exists that calls may be used to maintain ant association. In fact, some Neotropical Membracidae do appear to use vibrational communication when being tended by ants (DeVries, personal obs.). Thus, it seems appropriate to speculate that calling may be a trait of many myrmecophilous insects (e.g., Coleoptera, Orthoptera, Homoptera), and the techniques employed here might be utilized to investigate calling ability in all arthropod taxa that form symbiotic associations with ants (see Hölldobler and Wilson, 1990: 472–529, for a list).

#### REFERENCES

- Alexander, R. D.  
1962. Evolutionary change in cricket acoustical communication. *Evolution* 16: 443–467.
- Ballmer, G., and G. F. Platt  
1988. A survey of the last instar larvae of the Lycaenidae of California. *J. Res. Lepid.* 27: 1–81.
- Baroni-Urbani, C., M. V. Buser, and E. Schilliger  
1988. Substrate vibration during recruitment in ant social organization. *Insectes Soc.* 35: 241–250.
- Bennet-Clark, H. C.  
1984. A particle velocity microphone for the song of small insects and other measurements. *J. Exp. Biol.* 108: 459–463.
- Broquin, F.  
1953. Notas sobre la metamorfosis de *Haemearis susanae* Orfila, 1953 con orgua mirmecofila (Lep.: Riodin.). *Rev. Soc. Entomol. Argentina* 16: 83–87.
- Bruch, C. T.  
1926. Orugas mirmecofilas de *Haemearis epuulus signatus* Stich. *Rev. Soc. Entomol. Argentina* 1: 2–9.
- Callaghan, C. J.  
1977. Studies on Restinga butterflies I. Life cycle and immature biology of *Menander felsina* (Riodinidae), a myrmecophilous metalmark. *J. Lepid. Soc.* 20: 36–42.  
1982. Notes on immature biology of two myrmecophilous Lycaenidae: *Juditha molpe* (Riodininae) and *Panthiades bitias* (Lycaeninae). *J. Res. Lepid.* 20: 36–46.  
1986. Studies on Restinga butterflies: the biology of *Synargis brennus* (Stichel) (Riodinidae). *J. Lepid. Soc.* 40: 93–96.
- Claridge, M. F.  
1985. Acoustic behavior of leafhoppers and

- planthoppers: species problems and speciation. In L. E. Nault and J. C. Rodriguez (eds.), *Leafhoppers and planthoppers*, pp. 103–125. New York: Wiley.
- Clark, G. C., and C. G. C. Dickson  
1971. Life histories of Southern African lycaenid butterflies. Cape Town: Purnell.
- Cottrell, C. B.  
1984. Aphytophagy in butterflies: its relationship to myrmecophily. *Zool. J. Linn. Soc.* 79: 1–57.
- Dambach, M.  
1989. Vibrational responses. In F. Huber, T. E. Moore, and V. Loher (eds.), *Cricket behavior and neurobiology*, pp. 178–197. Ithaca: Comstock Press, Cornell Univ. Press.
- DeVries, P. J.  
1988. The larval ant-organs of *Thisbe irenea* (Lepidoptera: Riodinidae) and their effects upon attending ants. *Zool. J. Linn. Soc.* 9: 379–393.  
1990. Enhancement of symbioses between butterfly caterpillars and ants by vibrational communication. *Science* 248: 1104–1106.  
1991a. Evolutionary and ecological patterns in myrmecophilous riodinid butterflies. In R. Cutler and C. Huxley (eds.), *Interaction between ants and plants*, pp. 143–156. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press (in press).  
1991b. Detecting and recording the calls produced by butterfly caterpillars and ants. *J. Res. Lepid.* (in press).  
1991c. The mutualism between *Thisbe irenea* and ants, and the role of ant ecology in the evolution of larval-ant associations. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* 43: 179–195.
- Devries, P. J., and I. Baker  
1989. Butterfly exploitation of an ant-plant mutualism: adding insult to herbivory. *J. New York Entomol. Soc.* 97: 332–340.
- Downey, J. C., and A. C. Allyn  
1973. Butterfly ultrastructure, 1. Sound production and associated abdominal structures in pupae of Lycaenidae and Riodinidae. *Bull. Allyn Mus.* 14: 1–48.  
1978. Sounds produced in pupae of Lycaenidae. *Bull. Allyn Mus.* 48: 1–14.  
1979. Morphology and biology of the immature stages of *Leptotes cassius theonus* (Lucas) (Lep.: Lycaenidae). *Bull. Allyn Mus.* 55: 1–27.
- Ehrlich, P. R.  
1958. The comparative morphology, phylogeny, and higher classification of the butterflies (Lepidoptera: Papilionoidea). *Univ. Kansas Sci. Bull.* 39: 305–370.
- Elfferich, N. W.  
1988. Gerauschproduktion bei Lycaenidenpuppen (Lepidoptera). *Mitt. Entom. Ges. Basel* 38: 156–168.
- Eliot, J. N.  
1973. The higher classification of the Lycaenidae (Lepidoptera): a tentative arrangement. *Bull. Br. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), Entomol.* 28: 371–505.
- Eltringham, H.  
1921. On the larvae and pupae of Lepidoptera, chiefly Lycaenidae, collected by C. O. Farquharson, W. A. Lamborn, and Rev. Canon K. St. A. Rogers. *Trans. Entomol. Soc. London* 1921: 473–489.
- Ewing, A. W.  
1984. Acoustic signals in insect sexual behavior. In T. Lewis (ed.), *Insect communication*, pp. 223–240. London: Academic Press.
- Farquharson, C. O.  
1921. Five years' observations (1914–1918) on the bionomics of Southern Nigerian insects, chiefly directed to the investigation of lycaenid life-histories and the relation of Lycaenidae, Diptera, and other insects to ants. *Trans. Entomol. Soc. London* 1921: 319–448.
- Fiedler, K., and U. Maschwitz  
1988. Functional analysis of the myrmecophilous relationships between ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) and lycaenids (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae). II. Lycaenid larvae as trophobiotic partners of ants—a quantitative approach. *Oecologia* 75: 204–206.  
1989. Functional analysis of the myrmecophilous relationships between ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) and lycaenids (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae). I. Release of food recruitment in ants by lycaenid larvae and pupae. *Ethology* 80: 71–80.
- Gogala, M.  
1985. Vibrational communication in insects (biophysical and behavioural aspects). In K. Kalmring and N. Elsner (eds.), *Acoustic and vibrational communication in insects*, pp. 117–126. Berlin and Hamburg: Verlag Paul Parey.
- Harvey, D. J.  
1987. The higher classification of the Riodin-

- idae (Lepidoptera). Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Texas, Austin, TX.
- Hinton, H. E.  
 1948. Sound production in lepidopterous pupae. *Entomologist* 81: 254–269.  
 1951. Myrmecophilous Lycaenidae and other Lepidoptera—a summary. *Proc. Trans. S. London Entomol. and Nat. Hist. Soc.* 1949–1950: 111–175.
- Hoegh-Guldberg, O.  
 1972. Pupal sound production of some Lycaenidae. *J. Res. Lepid.* 10: 127–147.
- Hölldobler, B., and E. O. Wilson  
 1990. *The ants*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press.
- Kristensen, N. P.  
 1976. Remarks on the family-level phylogeny of butterflies. *Z. Zool. Syst. Evolutionsforsch.* 14: 25–33.
- Malicky, H.  
 1970. New aspects of the association between lycaenid larvae (Lycaenidae) and ants (Formicidae, Hymenoptera). *J. Lepid. Soc.* 24: 190–202.
- Markl, H., and B. Hölldobler  
 1978. Recruitment and food retrieving behavior in *Novomessor* (Formicidae, Hymenoptera). II. Vibration signals. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 4: 183–216.
- Michelsen, A., and H. Nocke  
 1974. Biophysical aspects of sound communication in insects. *Adv. Insect Physiol.* 10: 247–296.
- Ossiannilsson, F.  
 1949. Insect drummers. *Opusc. Entomol. Suppl.* 10: 1–145.
- Pierce, N. E.  
 1987. The evolution and biogeography of associations between lycaenid butterflies and ants. *Oxford Surv. Evol. Biol.* 4: 89–116.
- Pierce, N. E., R. L. Kitching, R. C. Buckley, M. F. J. Taylor, and K. F. Benbow  
 1987. The costs and benefits of cooperation between the Australian lycaenid butterfly, *Jalmenus evagoras*, and its attendant ants. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 21: 237–248.
- Robbins, R. K.  
 1988. Comparative morphology of the butterfly foreleg coxa and trochanter (Lepidoptera) and its systematic implications. *Proc. Entomol. Soc. Washington* 90: 133–154.
- Ross, G. N.  
 1964. Life history studies on Mexican butterflies II. Early stages of *Anatole rossi*, a new myrmecophilous metalmark. *J. Res. Lepid.* 3: 81–94.  
 1966. Life history studies of a Mexican butterfly. IV. The ecology and ethology of *Anatole rossi*, a myrmecophilous metalmark. *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am.* 59: 985–1004.
- Schremmer, F.  
 1978. On the bionomy and morphology of the myrmecophilous larva and pupa of the neotropical butterfly species *Hamaeris erostratus* (Lep.: Riodinidae). *Entomol. Gen.* 4: 113–121.
- Thomas, J. A., G. W. Elmes, J. C. Wardlaw, and M. Woyciechowski  
 1989. Host specificity among *Maculinea* butterflies in *Myrmica* ant nests. *Oecologia* 79: 452–457.
- Way, M. J.  
 1963. Mutualism between ants and honeydew producing Homoptera. *Ann. Rev. Entomol.* 8: 307–344.

Recent issues of the *Novitates* may be purchased from the Museum. Lists of back issues of the *Novitates*, *Bulletin*, and *Anthropological Papers* published during the last five years are available free of charge. Address orders to: American Museum of Natural History Library, Department D, Central Park West at 79th St., New York, N.Y. 10024.

**THIS PUBLICATION IS PRINTED ON ACID-FREE PAPER.**